

Application No. 10/645,160

Reply to Office Action

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

*Status of the Application*

Claims 1-20, 22-41 and 43-52 are currently pending. Of these claims, claims 15 and 36 are amended, now incorporating therein the subject matter of canceled (without prejudice) claims 21 and 42, while claims 43-52 are newly added. Support for the newly presently claims may be found throughout the specification, as well as in, e.g., claims 15-20 and 36-41 as originally filed. No new matter had been added by this amendment.

*Summary of the Office Action*

Claims 1, 5 and 6 are rejected as anticipated by, or alternatively as obvious over, U.S. Patent 5,447,824 to Mutsaers et al. ("Mutsaers").

Claims 15, 19, 20, 36, 40 and 41 are rejected as anticipated by, or alternatively as obvious over, PCT Publication 98/54767 ("PCT").

Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 16-18, 21, 37-39 and 42 are objected to as depending on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if written in proper independent form.

*Comments on the Rejections*

At the outset, applicants note that several of the pending claims are allowable, including claims 21 and 42. In view of this, the substance of allowed claim 21 has been introduced into rejected claim 15, rendering claims 15, 19 and 20 allowable. Similarly, the substance of allowed claim 42 has been introduced into rejected claim 36, rendering claims 36, 40 and 41 allowable. In view of these amendments, the anticipation/obviousness rejections of claims 15, 19, 20, 36, 40 and 41 in view of the PCT publication have been overcome. Withdrawal of these rejections is, therefore, respectfully solicited.

Applicants further note that the newly presented claims also are allowable over the cited prior art, as they incorporate allowable subject matter (as noted above) therein.

Turning to the rejection of claims 1, 5 and 6, applicants submit that the conductive layer configuration provided by following the process disclosed and taught by Mutsaers et al. is different from that described in claim 1. Specifically, Mutsaers et al. discloses and teaches a process for providing a pattern on an electrically conductive polymer on a

Application No. 10/645,160

Reply to Office Action

substrate surface, wherein the pattern produced may be further electroplated. The conductive layer configuration resulting from this further (electroplating) step comprises two contiguous layers—one being a pattern of an electrically conductive polymer and the other being a pattern of conductive silver. Although the layer on which the non-contiguous layer conductive silver is deposited is itself a continuous layer, only part of it is an electrically conductive polymer. The pattern of electrically conductive polymer in this layer thus represents a discontinuous layer of electrically conductive polymer. Thus, this conductive layer configuration is different than that disclosed and taught in Mutsaers et al. Mutsaers et al. further fail to motivate one skilled in the art to provide the claimed subject matter.

Moreover, Mutsaers et al. do not describe or teach their process as a photographic process, and thus cannot encompass a process involving the exposure of a desensitized liquid to patterned radiation, following by heating to form a conductive pattern and subsequent electroplating of the conducting pattern.

#### *Conclusion*

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher T. Griffith, Reg. No. 33,392  
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.  
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900  
180 North Stetson Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780  
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)  
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: May 10, 2005